UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,802	09/12/2003	Thomas D. Lovett	BEA920020019US1	8363
	7590 10/07/200 S OF MICHAEL DRY,	EXAMINER		
	ER RD #105-248	ROJAS, MIDYS		
GILBERT, AZ 85233			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2185	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/661,802	LOVETT ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	MIDYS ROJAS	2185		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 A This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under A	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct should be considered as a constant of the should be considered as a constant	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/661,802 Page 2

Art Unit: 2185

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/16/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, filed on 8/16/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 35 USC 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Palanca et al. (6,223,258).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams, III (2003/0110356 A1) in view of Palanca et al. (6,223,258).

Regarding Claim 1, Williams III discloses a method comprising:

evicting a first memory line currently stored in a cache (selecting a victim cache line to be replaced, paragraph 0035; if the cache line to replaced has been altered, it must be written back to main memory 8, paragraph 0036. The selection of the victim cache line and writing back to main memory if altered, represents the eviction of this cache line) and storing a second memory line not currently stored in the cache in place of the first memory line in the cache (when the processor executes an instruction that causes a cache miss, a line fill operation retrieves data from the main memory, selects a victim cache line to replace with this data and writes the new data in the victim cache line, paragraph 0035);

while evicting the first memory line, temporarily storing the second memory line in a buffer (fill buffer 12); a buffer also storing eviction data regarding the first memory line (evicted data is written to the write buffer 14, paragraph 0036) and data resulting from conversion of the second memory line into a set of concurrently performable actions (set of performable actions that follow for the completion of a line fill operation, paragraphs 0042-0049);

upon eviction of the first memory line, moving the second memory line from the buffer into the cache (paragraphs 0041-0049 describe the eviction of the victim cache line and the storage of the new cache line from the fill buffer to the location of the victim cache line).

Williams, III does not teach that the eviction data is stored in the same buffer as the second memory line wherein the eviction data is stored in only the buffer so that the eviction data is never stored in any other buffer other than the buffer.

Palanca et al. discloses the use of a load buffer to store read instructions and a write buffer to store write instructions (Col. 3, line 64- Col. 4, line 5). Palanca et al. also discloses that alternatively, the system may use a single unified buffer for storing both the read and write instructions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Williams III (as shown in Figure 1) by replacing the two buffers 12 and 14 with an unified buffer as suggested by Palanca et al. since a unified buffer would provide for a simpler system with less components while also making the system more versatile by employing a buffer that has more than one use. Also, in employing one buffer instead of two, the modification would result in a cheaper system to manufacture.

Regarding Claim 2, Williams III in view of Palanca et al. discloses the method further initially comprising receiving a transaction relating to the second memory line not currently in the cache (load requests to data not residing in the cache resulting in load data access misses, paragraph 0035; servicing write requests, paragraph 0041).

Regarding Claim 3, Williams III in view of Palanca discloses the method further comprising, after temporarily storing the second memory line in the buffer, providing a response indicating that a transaction relating to the second memory line has been performed (data word that gave rise to the miss is recovered form main memory and streamed to the cache, stored in the fill buffer, and streamed in parallel to the requesting processor; paragraphs 0037 and 0041; wherein the response to the request indicating that the transaction has been performed is in the form of servicing the request by streaming the data to the requesting processor).

Regarding Claim 4, Williams III in view of Palanca discloses the method wherein evicting the first memory line currently stored in the cache comprises inserting the first memory line in an eviction queue of memory lines to be evicted from the cache (dirty data to be evicted is written out to a write buffer and then written to the main memory, paragraph 0036 wherein the write buffer represents the eviction queue since it holds that data will be evicted once it is replaced by the new cache line).

Regarding Claim 5, Williams III in view of Palanca discloses the method wherein temporarily storing the second memory line in the buffer comprises temporarily storing the second memory line in a data transfer buffer (DTB). The new data that is to be written to the cache (data the caused the cache miss) is written to a fill buffer 12 wherein the fill buffer is a DTB since it buffers the data that is being transferred from the main memory to the cache (paragraph 0041).

5. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams III (2003/0110356 A1) in view of Palanca et al. (6,223,258) further in view of Chryson et al. (6,549,930).

Regarding Claim 6, Williams III in view of Palanca et al. discloses the method of Claim 1 above. Williams III in view of Palanca et al. does not teach converting a transaction to which the second memory line relates into a set of concurrently performable actions using a multiple-stage pipeline.

Chryson et al. discloses converting a transaction (in the pipeline the instructions are decoded for execution, Col. 8, lines 51-55) into a set of concurrently performable actions (plurality of stages serially arranged such as fetch, map, issue, execute, and

retire, Col. 8, lines 62-64) using a multiple-stage pipeline (multiple execution pipeline, Col. 8, lines 34-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Williams III in view of Palanca et al. to include the multiple stage pipeline of Chryson since the multiple stages of the pipeline allow improved system performance.

Regarding Claim 7, Williams III in view of Palanca et al. further in view of Chryson et al. discloses the method wherein evicting the first memory line currently stored in the cache comprises inserting the first memory line in an eviction queue of memory lines to be evicted from the cache (dirty data to be evicted is written out to a write buffer and then written to the main memory, paragraph 0036) after the transaction has been converted into the set of concurrently performable actions (since a transaction causes the cache miss, which in turn caused the eviction, then the transaction must have been converted in order to be executed).

Regarding Claim 8, Williams III in view of Palanca et al. further in view of Chryson et al. discloses the method wherein temporarily storing the second memory line in the buffer comprises temporarily storing the second memory line in a data transfer buffer (DTB). The new data that is to be written to the cache (data the caused the cache miss) is written to a fill buffer 12 wherein the fill buffer is a DTB since it buffers the data that is being transferred from the main memory to the cache (paragraph 0041).

Regarding Claim 9, Williams III in view of Palanca et al. further in view of Chryson et al. discloses the method further comprising, after temporarily storing the second memory line in the buffer, providing a response indicating that a transaction

Art Unit: 2185

relating to the second memory line has been performed (data word that gave rise to the miss is recovered form main memory and streamed to the cache, stored in the fill buffer, and streamed in parallel to the requesting processor; paragraphs 0037 and 0041; wherein the response to the request indicating that the transaction has been performed is in the form of servicing the request by streaming the data to the requesting processor).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MIDYS ROJAS whose telephone number is (571)272-4207. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 6:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sanjiv Shah can be reached on (571) 272-4098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/661,802 Page 8

Art Unit: 2185

/Midys Rojas/ Examiner, Art Unit 2185

MR